
Box No. I Basis of the opinion

- 1 With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
- 2 With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
- 3 ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished
- 4 Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1 ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis 1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis 1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2 ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis 1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1 Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	2,3,5-8,11,18,23,24,26,29
	No: Claims	1,4,9,10,12-17,19-22,25,27,28
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-29
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-29
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 5,890,441 A (JAMES TERRY J ET AL.) 6 April 1999 (1999-04-06)

D2: FR 943 005 A (MILES AIRCRAFT LTD) 24 February 1949 (1949-02-24)

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of **claim 1** is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 2.1. The document D1 discloses (see figure 1, the references in parentheses applying to this document):

An aircraft configuration of self-propelled Mini UAV* (see paragraph 2.2 below) comprising a fore wing (4) and an aft wing (1) in tandem close-coupled arrangement, wherein said aft wing (1) has side panels (9) and control surfaces (10), and tapered planform with positive sweep, said fore wing (4) has non-positive trailing edge sweep, the fore (4) and aft wing (1) being disposed at different height, and said arrangement being free of additional wings or tail arrangement

All the features of claim 1 are therefore known from D1.

- 2.2. * When considering the same aircraft configuration for a Micro UAV, the subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

According to the definition of Defence Advance Research Project Agency (DARPA) of the USA and also acknowledge in page 1 of the description of the present application, Mini-UAV are vehicles of about 20 cm to 1.2 m size and Micro UAV are limited to 15 cm (6 inc.). A Micro UAV could therefore be considered a scaled-down version of a Mini UAV.

The skilled person would therefore regard it as a normal design option to use this aircraft configuration of a Mini UAV for a Micro UAV type aircraft, namely when the same result is to be achieved, i.e. an improved aerodynamic design (see also

document D1; column 1, line 49 to column 12, line 18)

The subject-matter of claim 1, when concerning a Micro UAV, does therefore not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

3. **Dependent claims 2-29** do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Articles 33(2) and/or (3) PCT), the reasons being as follows:
 - 3.1. Claims 4, 9, 10, 12-17, 19-22, 25, 27 and 28: All the features of these claims are also disclosed by D1.
 - 3.2. Claims 2, 3, 8 and 11: The features of these claims have already been employed for the same purpose in a similar aircraft configuration, see document D2 (see figures). It would be obvious to the person skilled in the art, namely when the same result is to be achieved, to apply these features with corresponding effect to an aircraft configuration according to document D1, thereby arriving at an aircraft configuration according to claim 1.
 - 3.3. Claims 5, 6, 7, 18, 23, 24, 26 and 29: The skilled person would regard it as a normal design option to include the features of these claims in the aircraft configuration described in document D1 in order to solve the problems posed.